DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 319 SP 033 201

AUTHOR Peters, Karen; Crisci, Pat E.
TITLE Second Year Results of the TRIVET Program (Techniques of Responsive Intervention To Validate Effective Teaching): A School-University Partnership in the Appraisal of Classroom Instruction.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the National Conference for Professors of Educational Administration Conference-Within-A-Convention (New Orleans, LA, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Literature Reviews; Master Teachers; Principals; *Staff Development; *Supervisory Training; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS TRIVET Program

ABSTRACT

The Techniques of Responsive Intervention to Validate Effective Teaching (TRIVET) program is a year-long staff development training program involving principals and lead teachers in a collaborative effort to improve classroom instruction. The program provides an opportunity to develop the competencies necessary to effectively appraise classroom teaching and prescribe strategies for improvement. Since the goal of teacher appraisal is the improvement of instruction, this program offers a process which allows administrators to impact what happens in classrooms. Retraining administrators and lead teachers entails the use of a systematic research-based approach to classroom appraisal and lesson analysis. The training approach includes: (1) a preservice observation conference; (2) script-taping; (3) a post-observation conference; and (4) an action plan. Through appropriate diagnosis and development of prescriptions for improvement, the administrator demonstrates a knowledge of good instruction. The overall implication is that by offering suggestions for improved classroom instruction, the principal can facilitate increased teacher effectiveness and the achievement of students can be enhanced. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335319

Second Year Results of the TRIVET Program (Techniques of Responsive Intervention to Validate Effective Teaching): A School-University Partnership in the Appraisal of Classroom Instruction

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen Peters

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Karen H. Peters, Ph.D.
Project Coordinator, Center for School Personnel Relations

Pat E. Crisci, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies, and
Director, Center for School Personnel Relations
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242

1991 NCPEA Conference-Within-A-Convention
New Orleans, LA

SP 033 201

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OVERVIEW

As part of the national agenda to Reform the American educational system, much effort has been devoted to the enhancement of teacher education programs. Teachers are being better prepared to meet the challenges of the classroom, and it is now time to better assure their success by concentrating on the pre- and inservice education of principals in the same skills and competencies currently being taught to teachers. By using the same criteria and a common language to describe effective teaching, principals and teachers are more likely to develop a shared sense of vision and commitment to improving instruction. Without knowledge of the teacher effectiveness research and accompanying supervisory skills, the principal is unable to provide adequate and consistent support to help teachers maintain those skills acquired in preservice training. Moreover, principals who are truly instructional leaders provide direction for the collaborative enhancement of these skills. In effect, the essential elements of the professional preparation programs for teachers must also become the foundation of training for principals and supervisors.

To this end, a program has been developed entitled Techniques of Responsive Intervention to Validate Effective Teaching (TRIVET). TRIVET is an administrative training program that provides the instructional leader with the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively appraise classroom teaching. Based on the current research in teacher effectiveness, the program enables participants to collect data, diagnose the effectiveness of instruction, and prescribe needed strategies for improvement. Through actual implementation with classroom teachers, participants learn to identify specific

instructional behaviors that lead to improved student achievement and overall teacher effectiveness. Participants are trained to use a Pre-conference to gather significant information about the teacher's overall planning as context for the lesson to be observed, Script-taping to record activities that occur during the lesson and to distinguish between events that went well and those that were not successful, Post-conferencing to discuss how the teaching behaviors impacted student learning and to consider alternate ways to present the lesson, and the Action Plan to collaboratively determine areas for growth, strategies for improvement, criteria for success, a timeline, and resources for assistance.

Nearly 300 principals and teachers have participated in TRIVET training since 1986. The program has been offered both as a graduate course and as a year-long workshop through the department of educational administration. The success of the program has been evaluated annually through the appraisal of written materials accompanying each participant's observations, an evaluation of the training by participants at the conclusion of the program, and the extent to which each participant's skills improved as a function of the training. To determine participant growth, a videotaped teaching segment is appraised prior to and following the TRIVET training program. A comparison between pre- and post-test results for each year since 1988 has shown considerable gain in 90% of the participants. Feedback sheets kept on the written materials submitted with each of several observations revealed steady improvement in the quality of participant Pre-Conferences, Scripting, Past-Conferences, and Action Plans. Throughout the four years TRIVET has been taught, participants

have evaluated the program as outstanding, and have expressed enthusiastic support and appreciation for the experience. Collectively, these results indicate that the program is making an impact on using what we know about teaching to improve the quality of supervision and support provided by the building principal. The efficacy of the TRIVET training program was statistically determined through an in-depth research study involving two experimental groups and one control group. The gains made by both groups of trainees were significantly stronger than those of the control group, and the impact of the training was maintained over time with six-month follow-up scores showing an increase over post-test scores (Peters, 1990). Therefore, we believe that the program has considerable merit for institutions preparing building principals, mentor teachers, peer advisors, and instructional supervisors. The use of the TRIVET system will increase the likelihood that the instructional support given classroom teachers will be congruent with their academic training and field experience.

THE TRIVET PROGRAM

The TRIVET program is a staff development effort to involve the building principal and classroom teacher in a collaborative effort to improve classroom instruction. Techniques of Responsive Intervention to Validate Effective Teaching, known as TRIVET, is a year-long training program that provides building principals and lead teachers the opportunity to develop the competencies necessary to effectively appraise classroom teaching and prescribe strategies for improvement. These principal-teacher teams work collaboratively during the training to enhance the instructional effectiveness of the entire building.

The TRIVET training includes four processes for the collection and analysis of classroom data. They are (a) the **Pre-observation Conference** (b) **Script-taping** (c) the **Post-observation Conference** and (d) the **Action Plan.**

To accurately distinguish effective from ineffective instruction and to prescribe viable remediation or enrichment strategies for improvement, participants are provided training in the teaching behaviors identified by the Teacher Effectiveness and Process-Product research as positively correlated with student achievement. These behaviors include: (a) examination of year-long, unit, and daily **Planning**, including congruence among objectives, strategies, and assessments, the developmental sequencing of classroom activities, and the use of Bloom's taxonomy for variety of mental processing; (b) distinguishing effective from ineffective **Behavior Management**, including the use of a discipline plan, various levels of student involvement, grouping, pacing, and focusing attention as a management technique; (c) the **Organization of Time, Space, and Materials**, focusing on the efficient use of academic engaged time, transitions, routines and procedures, materials handling, and physical setting; (d) **Learning Climate** or the establishment of a businesslike and task-oriented atmosphere, nurturing positive teacher-pupil relations, including cooperative learning and the use of student interest surveys; (e) the **Assessment** of students prior to, during, and following instruction, using valid paper and pencil methods as well as several non-paper and pencil methods such as signalling or webbing, and correctly using standardized test results; (f) **Instructional Methods**, examining the criteria for effective motivation,

objectives, how to select the appropriate instructional strategy, and various elements of lesson design such as critical attributes, modeling, questioning, etc.; (g) **Oral and Written Communication**, including the effective use of the chalkboard, communications with parents and students, and providing clear explanations related to content; and (h) the fifteen TESA behaviors for teacher expectations.

During the training, participants review pertinent research findings, discuss specific instructional problems, and practice their appraisal skills on videotaped teaching segments. Between sessions, participants implement their training in the actual classrooms of fellow teachers in a collegial analysis of instructional behaviors. Each team jointly examines the instructional program in its particular building in order to identify the individual and collective needs for staff development pursuant to reform.

In the four years since its inception, the TRIVET program has involved over 1,700 classroom observations, the culmination of which has been over 1,500 classroom Action Plans developed to improve instruction throughout northeast Ohio. If TRIVET training results in the improvement of classroom instruction, it is anticipated that student achievement will increase proportionately.

TRIVET--A REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The components of the TRIVET system of teacher appraisal--the four processes for data collection and analysis, the seven modules for effective instruction, the year-long format including actual implementation with classroom teachers, and the collaboration among principals and teachers--are wrought from the instructional provisions of the Effective Schools, Teacher Effectiveness, Reform, and

Accountability research. Throughout the literature, teacher appraisal has received considerable attention as the primary reagent for helping teachers improve classroom instruction (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bolton, 1973; Buttram & Wilson, 1987; Castetter, 1986; Castetter & Burchell, 1967; Dunkleberger, 1982; Foley, 1981; George, 1987; Gephart & Engle, 1983; Jacobson, 1987; Johnson & Snyder, 1986; Klitgaard, 1987; Martin 1983-84; Medley & Crook; 1980; McGreal, 1988; NAESP, 1988; Popham, 1981; Prince, 1983-84; Redfern, 1964, 1966, 1980; Turner, 1986; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1984).

With the current interest in educational reform and greater accountability for student achievement, have come increased attention to specific teacher behaviors and the relationship between the quality of instruction and student outcomes (Brophy, 1989; Calabrese, 1986; Cotton & Savard, 1980; DeRoche, 1981; Foley, 1981; Hobar & Sullivan, 1983-84; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Lezotte, 1982; McGreal, 1988; Medley & Coker, 1987; NAESP, 1986; Robinson, 1985; Rupley, Wise, & Logan, 1986; Texas, 1986-87; Turner, 1983). The significant contribution of teacher appraisal to the Reform and Accountability initiatives, specifically in the improvement of student achievement, depends on making it possible for evaluators to identify competent teaching, to identify ineffective teaching behaviors, to prescribe specific strategies for improvement, and to validly monitor changes in teacher competency (Bartalo, 1988; Bolton, 1973; Calabrese, 1986; Good & Brophy, 1984; Hall, 1980; Klitgaard, 1987, Leithwood & Montgomery, 1984; Medley, Coker, & Soar, 1984; NAESP, 1988; Popham, 1981; Prince, 1983-84, Redfern, 1980; Sadler, 1982).

Prior to 1950, classroom appraisal was more a function of such

indirect variables as teacher personality and/or the number of "tallies" on a checklist than on the direct interaction between teacher and student. Despite their popularity, neither the trait nor the checklist approaches resulted in greater pupil learning gains (Medley et al., 1984). It was not until the latter half of the 1900s that teacher evaluators began to record and analyze teacher behaviors in terms of their effect on student response (Anderson, 1954; Furst, 1971; Hobar & Sullivan, 1984; Medley, 1972; Medley & Mitzel, 1958; Rosenshine, 1970; Soar, 1972a, 1972b; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983). The teacher behavior-student response approach to classroom appraisal has been the onus of the Teacher Effectiveness and Process-Product research. Classroom performance is carefully scrutinized to distinguish the behaviors of effective teachers from those who are unsuccessful (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Brophy, 1973; Brophy & Evertson, 1974; Crawford et al., 1978; Duffy, 1981; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Furst, 1971; Good, 1983-84; Hobar & Sullivan 1984; Medley & Crook, 1980; Rosenshine & Furst, 1973; Rupley et al., 1986; Soar & Soar, 1972).

The Effective Schools research has placed considerable emphasis on the principal's performance as an instructional leader rather than as a building manager. Strong correlations were found among principal expectations for teachers, teacher expectations of students, and student achievement. In effective schools, the role of the instructional leader was to establish with the building staff specific learning expectations, deliver to teachers the necessary materials to carry out the instructional programs, and continuously evaluate the level of mastery evidenced by students and staff alike (Anderson &

Nicholson, 1987; Brookover et al., 1982; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Calabrese, 1986; Cotton & Savard, 1980; DuFour & Eaker, 1987; Gigliotti & Brookover, 1975; Jackson, Logsdon, & Taylor, 1983; Johnson & Snyder, 1986; Klitgaard, 1987; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Lezotte, 1983; MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983; Manasse, 1984; McCurdy, 1983; NAESP, 1986; O'Neill & Shoemaker, 1989; Robinson, 1985; Weller, 1985; Worner & Stokes, 1987; Zumwalt, 1982).

Despite the importance of teacher appraisal and the principal's position of authority to perform it, scholars and practitioners alike perceive it as ineffective in improving the quality of classroom instruction (Buttram & Wilson, 1987; Castetter, 1986; Ellis, 1984; Harris, 1987; McGreal, 1988; Prince, 1983-84; Savage, 1982; Smith, 1984). As the person most directly responsible for classroom evaluation, the principal has been subjected to considerable scrutiny by researchers. Among the principal's weaknesses is the inability to connect specific teacher behaviors with student outcomes (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bartalo, 1988; Bolton, 1973; Calabrese, 1986; Castetter & Burchell, 1967; Klitgaard, 1987; Lamb & Thomas, 1981; Leithwood, Stanley, & Montgomery, 1984; Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983; Wood & Pohland, 1979). A second weakness is the principal's inability to distinguish effective from ineffective instruction (Castetter & Burchell, 1967; DeRoche, 1981; DuFour & Eaker, 1987; Jacobson, 1987; Johnson & Snyder, 1986; Klitgaard, 1987, Klopf, Scheldon, & Brennan, 1982; Lamb & Thomas, 1981; Larsen, 1987; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983; Manasse, 1984; Notar, 1987; O'Neill & Shoemaker, 1989). A third difficulty is the lack of consistency among appraisers as to

what is effective. When there is more than marginal variance in the interpretation of a teaching segment, the impression given is that effective teaching is more a function of principal taste than of sound pedagogy (Calabrese, 1986; Furst, 1971, Medley & Mitzel, 1958; Soar et al., 1983). A fourth weakness is the persistence of an adversarial rather than collaborative relationship between the teacher and principal in the evaluation of classroom teaching. When appraisal is perceived as a weapon for fault-finding rather than as a group process for problem-solving, there is resistance among teachers against any proposed reforms (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bartalo, 1988; Castetter & Burchell, 1967; DuFour & Eaker, 1981; George, 1987; Jacobson, 1987; McGreal, 1982, 1988; O'Neill & Shoemaker, 1989; Popham, 1988; Soar et al., 1983; Wood & Pohland, 1979). Another source of teacher distrust is the feeling that the principal is out of touch with what occurs in classrooms, especially the extenuating circumstances that prevent teachers from being successful (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Andrews & Knight, 1987; Lamb & Thomas, 1981; March, Peters, & Orrach, 1988; Seyfarth & Nowinski, 1987; Turner, 1986).

Most researchers have attributed each of the above weaknesses to a singular problem: the lack of appropriate training. It is unfortunate that the majority of preparation programs for principal certification require very little coursework or field experience in instructional supervision. This lack of training in the appraisal of classroom teaching seriously impairs the ability of the principal to distinguish effective from ineffective instruction and to provide meaningful intervention (Andrews & Knight, 1987; Bartalo, 1988; Bolton, 1973; Brandt, 1987; Buttram & Wilson, 1987; Calabrese, 1986;

DuFour & Eaker, 1987; Good, 1983-84; Johnson & Snyder, 1986; Klitgaard, 1987; Lewis, 1983-84; McKenna, 1981; Rutherford, Hord, & Thurber, 1984; Seeley, 1984; Snyder, 1984; Turner, 1986; Wise et al., 1984).

TRIVET was developed in response to the need for more effective classroom appraisals. As a staff development program, TRIVET involves principals and lead teachers in a collaborative effort to diagnose the instructional program in each building and to prescribe the necessary reforms for improvement. As part of a larger project to assess, monitor, and eventually increase student performance levels, TRIVET focuses on the following correlates in the Effective Schools research: The instructional leadership of the building principal, the quality of classroom teaching, and teacher expectations for student success. Each of the components of the TRIVET program is derived from needs identified in the Effective Schools, Teacher Effectiveness/Process-Product, Reform, and Accountability research.

The skills and attitudes necessary to conduct effective classroom appraisal are developmental and must be nurtured over time and advantaged by actual practice (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Andrews & Knight, 1987; Hunter, 1988; Klitgaard, 1987; Manatt, 1988). To allow adequate time for presentation, application of the skills, and the establishment of effective collegial relationships, the training spans an entire year. The four processes for data collection and analysis are culled directly from the literature: (a) the **Pre-observation Conference** (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Manatt, Palmer, & Hildebaugh, 1976; McGreal, 1982, 1988; Petrie, 1982; Prince, 1983-84; Redfern & Hersey, 1980; Stow & Sweeney, 1981; (b) **Scripting** or data-

gathering during the classroom observation (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Ellman, 1976; Good & Brophy, 1984; Hunter, 1988; Lamb & Thomas, 1981; Manatt et al., 1976; Medley et al., 1984; McGreal, 1982; NAESP, 1988; Savage, 1982); (c) the **Post-observation Conference** (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bartalo, 1988; Berliner, 1980; Bolton, 1973; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Dunkleberger, 1982; Hunter, 1988; Jacobson, 1987; Klitgaard, 1987; Manatt et al., 1976; Medley et al., 1984; McGreal, 1988; NAESP, 1988; Redfern & Hersey, 1980; Sadler, 1982; Scriven, 1988; Sweeney, 1982); and (d) **Action Planning** (Acheson & Gall, 1987; DeRoche, 1981; Good & Brophy, 1984; Hunter, 1988; Jacobson, 1987; Klitgaard, 1987; Lamb & Thomas, 1981; Manatt et al., 1976; McGreal, 1988; NAESP, 1988; Redfern & Hersey, 1980).

The criteria for effective instruction are derived from the Teacher Effectiveness research and include Planning; Behavior Management; Organization of Time, Space, and Materials; Learning Climate; Student Assessment; Instructional Methods; and Oral and Written Communication (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bartalo, 1988; Bolton, 1973; Brandt, 1987; Calabrese, 1986; Conley, 1987; Costa, Garmston, & Lambert, 1988; Dunkleberger, 1982; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Foley, 1981; Hunter, 1988; Jacobson, 1987; Manatt, 1988; McGreal, 1988; Medley et al., 1984; NAESP, 1988; Pembroke & Goedert, 1982; Prince, 1983-84; Redfern & Hersey, 1980; Sadler, 1982; Seyfarth & Nowinski, 1987; Stow & Sweeney, 1981).

Developed in accordance with current research and the demands for Reform, the TRIVET program represents a viable approach to training principals and lead teachers to conduct classroom appraisals that will result in meaningful improvements in the instructional program.

CONCLUSION

Since the goal of teacher appraisal is the improvement of instruction, this program offers a process which allows administrators to impact what happens in classrooms. This first step of retraining administrators and lead teachers entails the use of a systematic research-based approach to classroom appraisal and analysis of a lesson. Through appropriate diagnosis and development of prescriptions for improvement, the administrator demonstrates a knowledge of good instruction. The overall implication is that by offering suggestions for improved classroom instruction, the principal can facilitate increased teacher effectiveness, and the achievement levels of students can be enhanced.

TRIVET OUTCOMES THUSFAR

To determine the effectiveness of the TRIVET program, several measures were considered: (a) the pre- to post-test comparison of each participant's analysis of a videotaped classroom teaching segment, (b) the appraisal of the TRIVET program by participants, (c) the quality of the participants' written work in the appraisal of actual classroom teaching, (d) teacher self-report of changes in their classroom practices following TRIVET, and (e) the competence level of participating teachers as indicated on Teacher Effectiveness profiles collaboratively developed by each teacher and his or her building principal.

Pre- to post-test comparison. The overall score on the pre- and post-test was composed of 92 separate variables for the data collection, analysis, and prescription components combined for a total of 252 points. A score of 252 points is virtually perfect, requiring

the observer to note absolutely every miniscule detail of the lesson. It is more realistic to hope that even the most astute observer could note just over half the detail, or earn 140 points. Table 1 shows the mean results for each group of participants since 1988. The 1988-89 administrator group scored a pre-test mean of 38.31 and a post-test mean of 95.11 for a mean gain of 56.80 points. The 1988-89 administrator-teacher group scored 20.74 and 111.94 for a mean gain of 91.20 points (As a part of this study, a control group was included. This group received no training but were administered the pre- and post-test. The earned pre-test mean score was 35.41 and the mean post-test score was 37.91 for a mean gain of 2.5 points.).

The 1989-90 administrator group had pre-post scores of 48.54 and 88.23 for a mean gain of 39.69 points, and the 1989-90 administrator-teacher group scored 23.24 and 116.19 for a mean gain of 92.95 points. Finally, a 1989-90 group of teacher peer advisors earned 30.10 and 111.95, for a mean gain of 81.85 points. Table one also shows that in both years, the administrator-only group began the training with more skill than the teacher-administrator and teacher peer advisor groups in the area of data collection, but on the post-test, the administrator-only groups actually obtained lower scores, showing less growth than the other two groups. In the analysis area, the groups' initial scores showed no significant differences among them, but on the post-test, the administrator-only groups once again scored lower than the groups of administrators and teachers together.
The peer advisor group of teachers showed the greatest gain scores in the analysis area, obtaining the highest score of any group on the post-test. Likewise, the peer advisors did significantly better than any of the other groups in the area of prescription.

Table 1

Pretest and Post-test Means for the TRIVET Participants for the Subscales and the Overall Assessment

	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Points Gained
Data Collection			
administrator 1988-89	29.31	72.19	42.88
teacher/administrator 1988-89	12.58	82.26	69.68
administrator 1989-90	38.92	64.77	25.85
teacher/administrator 1989-90	15.76	84.76	69.00
teacher peer adivisor 1989-90	18.90	76.10	57.20
Analysis			
administrator 1988-89	7.53	18.03	10.50
teacher/administrator 1988-89	6.68	23.90	17.22
administrator 1989-90	7.54	18.23	10.69
teacher/administrator 1989-90	6.22	25.03	18.81
teacher peer advisors 1989-90	8.55	27.90	19.35
Prescription			
administrator 1988-89	1.47	4.89	3.42
teacher/administrator 1988-89	1.48	5.77	4.29
administrator 1989-90	2.08	5.23	3.15
teacher/administrator 1989-90	1.43	6.41	4.98
teacher peer advisors 1989-90	2.65	7.95	5.30
Overall			
administrator 1988-89	38.31	95.11	56.80
teacher/administrator 1988-89	20.74	111.94	91.20
administrator 1989-90	48.54	88.23	39.69
teacher/administrator 1989-90	23.43	116.19	92.76
teacher peer advisors 1989-90	30.10	111.95	81.85

Table 2 reflects the points gained from the pre- to the post-test in overall ranges. It should be noted that the ranges for administrator-only groups are in the lower half, while the teacher-administrator and peer advisors' scores are centered in the upper part of the scale.

The evidence from the pre- to post-test results indicates a positive impact on the participants' skills in conducting appropriate classroom appraisals as a result of the TRIVET training. However, there is a differential effect of the training between the administrator-only and teacher-administrator groups. The groups of teachers and administrators together showed significantly more gain than did the group consisting only of administrators. The conclusion reached from this difference in the outcomes for the two groups is that the training is more effective when teachers and administrators participate in the training together. The teachers expressed concern about not wanting to look as if they did not know good instruction while they were participating in the workshop with their building principals. Similarly, the principals said they did not want their teachers to think that, as the instructional leaders of their buildings, they did not know effective from ineffective instruction. The presence of the two groups together in the training appeared to raise the level of concern for both groups to perform better than if one or the other groups were in the training alone. The exception to this conclusion is the teacher peer advisor group who out-performed the other groups in the analysis and prescription components. In the first year of their program, the peer advisors were highly motivated to succeed. While still serving in the role of teacher, they evaluate

Table 2

Growth in Appraisal Skill from Pre- to Post-test in TRIVET Participation

	1988-98		1989-90		
Point Gain from Pre- to Post-test	administrator	teacher/ administrator	administrator	teacher/ administrator	peer advisor
0-10	1	0	1	0	0
11-20	2	0	2	0	0
21-30	1	0	2	0	0
31-40	3	0	2	1	2
41-50	7	0	2	0	0
51-60	4	1	1	2	1
61-70	4	5	1	2	3
71-80	12	4	2	7	3
81-90	1	5	0	7	3
91-100	1	6	0	7	4
101-110	0	3	0	8	2
111-120	0	5	0	2	2
121-130	0	1	0	0	0
131-140	0	1	0	1	0
	N=36	N=31	N=13	N=37	N=20

teachers, perform demonstration lessons, and work toward instructional improvement as their main job function.

Participant evaluation of TRIVET. Since its inception in 1988, the TRIVET program has enjoyed consistently enthusiastic appraisal by the nearly 300 participants, with 80% of the categories receiving the highest rating. Among the most frequently-cited strengths of the program have been the materials, the organization of the training, the data collection and analysis procedures, the actual observation of classrooms, workable suggestions for utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy, non-traditional assessments, learning styles, and instructional planning, the summaries of current research on teacher effectiveness, the opportunity to exchange ideas among other teachers and administrators, and the effectiveness of the workshop instruction. Among the skills respondents felt they gained as a function of their participation have been improvements in their own classroom instruction, citing areas such as planning, classroom management, learning climate, questioning skills, non-traditional assessments, and models of teaching. Participants also cited helpful reflectivity about their own strengths and weaknesses, increased skill in the diagnostics of classroom teaching and prescriptions for growth, greater understanding of Bloom, TESA, and learning styles and an expanded awareness of how to utilize cooperative learning. Other areas of growth reported by respondents included an increased sensitivity to others' needs, improved conferencing skills, and a greater sense of collaboration among staff members.

The quality of participants' written work. Participants were required to submit written assignments, each consisting of the four

processes: Pre-observation conference, scripting of class events, thePost-observation conference, and the Action Plan. To monitor the continued improvement in the quality of this written work, instructors completed a review sheet of evaluation criteria for each observation. The maximum number of points for each observation was 12. At the conclusion of the 1989-90 project year, 82% of the participants earned between 75 and 100% of the points possible; 53% earned between 83 and 100% of the points possible, and 24% earned between 92 and 100% of the points.

Teacher self-report of changes in classroom practice. In a follow-up survey, teacher participants of the 1989-90 TRIVET training reported several changes in their teaching practices as a result of their involvement. The most frequently-cited changes include an increased comfort level in working with fellow teachers to both seek and give feedback, greater specificity in making prescriptive suggestions, a healthier appreciation of differences among teaching styles, and an improved sense of confidence for honest self-appraisal and risk-taking. Additional changes were identified in the specific teacher effectiveness areas of planning, classroom management, organization of time, space, and materials, learning climate, student assessment, instructional methods, and oral and written communication.

Teacher Effectiveness profiles. At the conclusion of the program, TRIVET-trained principals and the TRIVET-trained teachers in their buildings collaboratively examined each teacher-trainee's level of competence in the behaviors identified by the Teacher Effectiveness research. These behaviors are those directly addressed throughout the TRIVET training. Of the 36 teachers profiled following the 1989-90

training, 99% of the participants scored at least 75% of the 60 possible points on the profiles. Specifically, 67% scored between 90% and 100%, 22% scored between 80% and 89%, and 11% between 70% and 79% of the points possible.

REFERENCE LIST

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.

Anderson, H.M. (1954). A study of certain criteria of teaching effectiveness. Journal of Experimental Education, 23, 66-71.

Anderson, C. & Nicholson, G. (1987). Instructional leadership--can it be mearured validly? Who performs what functions? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(502), 28-40.

Andrews, H. & Knight, J. (1987). Administrative evaluation of teachers: Resistance and rationale. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(503), 1-4.

Bartalo, D. (1988). Turn "B" teachers into "A+s". The School Administator, 11(45), 15-17.

Berliner, D. (1980). Using research on teaching for the improvement of classroom practice. Theory in Practice, 19(4), 302-310.

Bolton, D. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Brandt, R. (1987). On teacher evaluation: A conversation with Tom McGreal. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 20-24.

Brookover, W. B., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., & Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Brookover, W. B. & Lezotte, L. (1979). School characteristics associated with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Brophy, J. E. (1973). Stability of teacher effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal, 10, 245-252.

Brophy, J. (1989). Research: Safe harbor from political winds. The School Administrator, 1(46), 23, 26-27.

Brophy, J. & Evertson, C. (1974). Process-product correlations in the Texas Effectiveness Study, final report, Report No 74-4. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Buttram, J. & Wilson, B. (1987). Promising trends in teacher evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 4-6.

Calabrese, R. (1986). Effective schools and classroom instruction. The Clearing House, 59(6), 272-274.

Castetter, W. (1986). The personnel function in educational administration. New York: Macmillan.

Castetter, W. & Burchell, H. (1967). Educational administration and the improvement of instruction. Danville, IL: Educational Research and Service Bureau, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Conley, D. (1987). Critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 60-64.

Costa, A., Garmston, R., & Lambert, L. (1988). Evaluation of teaching: The cognitive development view. In S. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success(pp. 145-170). Alexandria, VA: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W. G. (1980). The principal as instructional leader. (Topic summary report). Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Research on School Effectiveness Project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 702)

Crawford, J., Gage, N., Corno, L., Stayrook, N., Mitman, A., Schunk, D., Stallings, J., Baskin, E., Hanvey, P., Austin, D., & Newman, R. (1978). An experiment on teacher effectiveness and parent assisted instruction in the third grade. Stanford, CA: Center for Educational Research at Stanford, Stanford University.

DeRoche, E. (1981). An administrator's guide for evaluating programs and personnel. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Duffy, G. (1981). Teacher effectiveness research: Implications for the reading profession. In M. L. Kamii (Ed.), Thirtieth yearbook of the national reading conference(pp.113-126). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

DuFour, R. & Eaker, R. (1987). The principal as leader: Two major responsibilities. National Associaltion of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(502), 80-89.

Duke, D. & Stiggins, R. (1986). Five keys to growth through teacher evaluation. Protland, OR: Northwest Regional Laboratory.

Dunkin, M. & Biddle, B. (1974). The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Dunkleberger, G. (1982). Classroom, observation-what should principals look for? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 66(458), 9-15.

Dunkleberger, G. (1987). Making the most of the post-observation conference. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(503), 51-55.

Ellis, T. (1984). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. ERIC Digest, No. 9. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Ellman, N. (1976). Evaluating representative teaching behaviors. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60(40), 25-27.

Foley, W. (1981). On evaluation and the evaluation of teachers. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa, Institute for School Executives. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 764)

Furst, N. (1971). Classroom observation, systematic. In I. Deighten (Ed.) The Encyclopedia of Education. New York: Macmillan.

George, P. (1987). Performance management in education. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 32-39.

Gephart, W. & Ingle, R. (1983). Introduction to Teacher evaluation: Gathering and using data(pp.1-8). Bloominton, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Gigliotti, R. & Broodover, W. (1975). The learining environment: A comparison of high and low achieveing elementary schools. Urban Education, 10, .

Good, T. (1983-84). Observation and the evaluation of teaching. In K. Klein (Ed.). Evaluation of teaching: The formative process(pp.107-150). Center of Evaluation, Development, and Research, Hot Topics Series. Bloomington IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1984). Looking in the classroom. New York: Harper & Row.

Hall, C. (1980). A study of issues involving teacher accountability and evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 854)

Harris, B. (1987). Resolving old dilemmas in diagnostic evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 46-49.

Hobar, N., & Sullivan, D. (1984). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.

Hunter, M. (1988). Create rather than await your fate in teacher evaluation. In S. Stanley and W.J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success(pp.32-54). Alexandria, VA: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jackson, S., Logsdon, D., & Taylor, N. (1983). Instructional leadership behaviors: Differentiating effective from ineffective low-income urban schools. Urban Education, 19(1), 59-70.

Jacobson, W. (1987). The rewards of instructional leadership. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(498), 57-58,60-66.

Johnson, W. & Snyder, K. (1986). Instructional leadership training needs for school principals. The Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 237-253.

Klitgaard, G. (1987). The principal's role in helping teachers manage their classrooms. National Association of Secondary School Administrators Bulletin, 71(502), 64-67.

Klopf, G., Scheldon, E. & Brennan, K. (1982). The essentials of effectiveness: A job description for principals. Principal, March, 35-38.

Lamb, R. & Thomas, M. (1981). The art and science of teacher evaluation. Principal, 61(1), 44-47.

Larsen, T. (1987, April). Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation of academic achievement. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, D. (1984). Obstacles preventing principals from becoming more effective. Education and Urban Society, 17(1), 73-88.

Leithwood, K., Stanley, K. & Montgomery, D. (1984). Training principals for school improvement. Education and Urban Society, 17(1), 49-71.

Lewis, J. (1983-84). Appraising teacher performance. In K. Klein (Ed.), Evaluation of teaching: The formative process(pp. 165-193). Center for Evaluation, Development, and Research, Hot Topics Series. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Lezotte. L. (1982). Effective schools research and its implications. Citizen Action in Education, 9, 10-11.

Lezotte, L. (1983, November). What is the effective school movement? The Effective School Report, 1, 1.

MacPhail-Wilson, B. & Guth, J. (1983). Effectiveness research and school administration-both sides of the coin. National Association of Secondary School Administrators Bulletin, 67(465), 3-8.

Manasse, A. L. (1984). Principals as leaders of high-performing systems. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 42-46.

Manatt, R. (1988). Teacher performance evaluation: A total systems approach. In S. Stanley amd W. J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success (pp. 79-108). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Manatt, R., Palmer, K., & Hidlebaugh, E. (1976). Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60(401), 21-24.

March, J., Peters, K., & Orrach, L. (1988). Techniques of responsive intervention to validate effective teaching. Unpublished manuscript, Kent State University, Center for School Personnel Relations, Kent, OH.

Martin, E. (1983-84). Teacher evaluation: A selected review of the recent literature. In K. Klein (Ed.), Evaluation of teaching: The formative process (pp. 65-68). Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research. Hot Topics Series. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

McCurdy, J. (1983). The role of the principal in effective schools (AASA critical issues report). Sacremento, CA: Education News Service.

McGreal, T. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. Educational Leadership, 39(4), 303-305.

McGreal, T. (1988). Evaluation for enhancing instruction: Linking teacher evaluation and staff development. In S. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success (pp.1-29). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McKenna, B. (1981). Context/environment effects in teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 23-39). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Medley, D. (1972). Early history of research on teacher behavior. International Review of Education, 18, 430-439.

Medley, D. & Coker, H. (1987). How valid are principal's judgements of teacher effectiveness? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(2), 138-140.

Medley, D., Coker, H., & Soar, R. (1984). Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance. New York: Longman.

Medley, D., & Crook, P. (1980). Research in teacher competency and teaching tasks. Theory into practice, 19(4), 294-301.

Medley, D., & Mitzel, H. (1958). A technique for measuring classroom behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49(2), 86-92.

NAESP (1986). Proficiencies for principals kindergarten through eighth grade. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

NAESP (1988). Effective teachers: Effective evaluation. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Notar, E. (1987). Principal as instructional manager: A meta-theory for evaluation of instruction. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(502), 89-91.

O'Neill, K., & Shoemaker, J. (Eds.). (1989). A conversation between James Comer and Ronald Edmonds: Fundamentals of effective school improvement. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Pembroke, E., & Goedert, E. (1982). What is the key to developing an effective teacher evaluation system? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 66(458), 29-37.

Peters, K. H. (1990). An analysis of a program to train administrators and lead teachers to be instructional leaders through effective classroom appraisal: TRIVET--Techniques of responsive intervention to validate effective teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, OH.

Petrie, T. (1982). Ideas that hinder evaluation: Debunking the myths. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 66(458), 52-55.

Popham, W. (1981, April 13-17). Teacher evaluation--the wrong tests for the right job. (Adapted from) a symposium presentation at a jointly sponsored session during the annual meetings of the National Council of Measurement in Education and the American Educational Research Association. Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 298)

Popham, W. (1988). Judgement-based teacher evaluation. In S. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success (pp. 56-77). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Prince, J. (1983-84). Formative teacher evaluation: The crucial element in an outcome-based education program. In K. Klein (Ed.), Evaluation of teaching: The formative process (pp. 85-94). Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research. Hot Topics Series. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Redfern, G. (1964). How to appraise teaching performance. Columbus, OH: School Management Institute, Inc.

Redfern, G. (1966). Improving principal-faculty relationships. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Redfern, G. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder,CO: Westview Press.

Redfern, G., & Hersey, P. (1980). Evaluation of teachers... Performance-improvement-commitments. The practitioner, 6(3), 1-17. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 817)

Robinson, G. (1985). Effective schools research: A guide to school improvements. Concerns in education. Arlington: Educational Research Service.

Rosenshine, B. (1970). Evaluation of classroom instruction. Review of Educational Research, 40, 279-300.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. (1973). The use of direct observation to study teaching. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching (pp. 122-183). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Rupley, W., Wise, B., & Logan, J. (1986). Research in effective teaching: An overview of its development. In J. Hoffman (Ed.), Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice (pp. 1-36).Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Russell, J., Mazzarella, J., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985). Linking the behaviors of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management Division, University of Oregon.

Rutherford, W., Hord, S., & Thurber, J. (1984). Preparing principals for leadership roles in school improvement. Education and Urban Society, 17(1), 29-48.

Sadler, N. (1982). The appraisal interview: Management techniques for evaluating teachers. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 66(458), 1-8.

Savage, J. (1982). Teacher evaluation without classroom observation. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 66(458), 41-45.

Scriven, M. (1988). Evaluating teachers as professionals: The duties-based approach. In S. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), Teacher evaluation: six prescriptions for success, (pp. 110-142). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Seeley, D. (1984). Who, when, what, where, why of educational leadership. The School Administrator, 41(11), 10-11.

Seyfarth, J., & Nowinski, E. (1987). Administrator feedback can improve classroom instruction. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(503), 47-49.

Smith, B. O. (1984). Forward to Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance (pp. xii-xiv). New York: Longman.

Snyder, K. (1984). Preparing principals to manage productive schools: A neglected dimension of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 55-57.

Soar, R. (1972a). Teacher-pupil interaction. In J. R. Squire (Ed.), A new look at progressive education. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Soar, R. (1972b). Teacher behavior related to pupil growth. International Review of Education, 18, 508-526.

Soar, R., Medley, D., & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 239-246.

Soar, R. S., & Soar, R. M. (1972). An empirical analysis of selected follow through programs: An example of a process approach to evaluation. In I. Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education (pp. 229-261). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stow, S., & Sweeney, J. (1981). Developing a teacher performance evaluation system. Educational Leadership, 38(7), 538-541.

Sweeney, J. (1982a). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 395), 346-352.

Texas Education Agency (1987). Texas teacher appraisal system orientation manual (1987-88). Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, Division of Management Assistance and Personnel Development.

Turner, B. (1983). (Pamphlet advertising the) KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center. Kent,OH: Kent State University.

Turner, R. (1986). Teachers speak out about their evaluations. Learning '86, 15(2), 58-67.

Weller, D. (1985). The principal: Catalyst for promoting effective schooling. Action in Teacher Education, 7(3), 7-12.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practice. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 559)

Wood, C., & Pohland, P. (1979). Teacher evaluation: The myths and realities. In W. Duckett (Ed.), Planning for the evaluation of teaching (pp. 73-83). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Worner, W., & Stokes, R. (1987). A Virginia study: Instructional leadership: What are the activities and who performs them? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71(502), 49-56.

Zumwalt, K. (1982). Research on teaching: Policy implications in teacher education. Eighty-first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.